



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/791,784	03/04/2004	Takahiro Ohkuma	Y0647.0147	5197
32172	7590	03/28/2008	EXAMINER	
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP			CEHIC, KENAN	
1177 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS (6TH AVENUE)			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK, NY 10036-2714			2616	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/28/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/791,784	OHKUMA, TAKAHIRO
	Examiner	Art Unit
	KENAN CEHIC	2616

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 March 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) 7 would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 7.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-6.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.

13. Other: _____.

/Kwang B. Yao/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2616

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

In respones to arguments regarding claim 1:

Applicant argues, on page 6, that Kawamura does not disclose the feature of controlling an clock to a macro is dependent on "no packet data is output for a predetermine time from all route of a macro an input side of said macro to be controlled". The office action clearly states that Kawamura disclose only a clock supply which controls the clock supply of that macro and that it is silent about the rest of the quoted limitations. The office action does not assert that the clock supply is dependent on the state/actions of a second macro.

On page 7 paragraphs 2 and 3, applicant generlly alleges that Lim does cure the deficiencies of Kawamura.

In regards to arguments that Lim does not cure the above deficiencies of Kawamura, the applicant argues, *inter alia*, that powering down does not meet the recited limitations of the clock supply unit. As asserted in the previous action, Lim clearly defines powering down as "each module....powered down simply by...turnining...of the transmission of the clock signal to it". Applicant further argues, on page 7 and 8 that Lim only controls clock supply of a module based on the packet being within the module, and not on an input side of a module. The examiner disagrees. From the state diagrams in figure 2 and 3 and the corresponding descriptions it is clear that once no new incoming packets (figure 2) or when the packet buffer is empty and all the lines are idle the module/switch is powered down in reference character 11 and 21 respectively. This even clearly described in the descriptions of figure 2 and 3. For example in section 0027, it is clearly states that if the queues are empty, the switching engine is powered down. Furthermore, in section 0031 it is stated that additionally to the state diagrams of Figure 2 and 3, the module stays powered up for a certain time after it is done transmitting. In the situation, where it is determined that the module is to be powered down, as shown in figure 2/3, the module is still powered up even no new incoming packets are present or packet buffer/queue is empty and RXs are idle. Thus no data is to be transmitted/outputed to the macro and after a certain period, the module powers off. Thus Lim cures the dificiencies of Kuwamura and meets the limitations of claim 1.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, both references deal with power reduction, via control of the clock supply, in a packet processing device; further both devices have modules for processing certain layers/function of a data.